

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2020 10:54 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	28
<b>Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants</b>		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	14
<b>State Plan</b>		
1. State Plan	35	33
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	11
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	86
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. CPP3	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. CPP4	4	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 5</b>		
1. CPP5	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CPP6	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CPP7	4	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	16	15
<b>Total</b>	116	101

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP State Entities - 3: 84.282A

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. a. Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 28

#### Sub

##### 1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale;

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides a research-based logic model to support project objectives. The application addresses all key priorities and provides data surrounding the current number of public charter school seats (e30-37). The applicant documents the existing need for increasing the number of high-quality seats in the District by sharing that in the SY2019-20 Common Lottery, there were 8,061 more unique applicants to public charter schools than seats offered by public charter schools (e51). The applicant provides a graph of data points concerning growth of charter schools (e491-492).

#### Weaknesses:

Although the applicant states past CSP planning and implementation funding for both 2010 and 2015 CSP grants, it is unclear how this information constitutes a strongly informed research and evaluation finding that would lead to a high likelihood of realizing relevant project outcomes of providing effective technical assistance or improving high school student PARCC statewide performance in ELA and math (e31).

Reader's Score: 12

##### 2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and

#### Strengths:

The applicant's performance measures are largely specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely (e38-41). Both qualitative and quantitative performance measures are clearly related to intended project outcomes. All objectives include at least one performance measure that can be reported on annually (e38-41).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear which performance measures are quantitative and which are qualitative due to data collection instruments and analysis procedures not being adequately described (e38-41). The applicant's Objective #1, "Increase the number of high-quality seats," does not have a corresponding specific performance measure (e38-39).

**Reader's Score: 13**

**3. (3) The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entities program**

**Strengths:**

The applicant ties the objectives to the project (e42-44). The application mentions annual PARCC results will be used in the Logic Model (e44).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant objectives are tied to the project, but may not be ambitious. The objective of increasing the number of high-quality seats in the District does not have corresponding data points for either the current number of high-quality seats or how much of an increase is desired (e42). The applicant does not provide a strong rationale for why objectives are ambitious, yet attainable. No data points are provided for charter school growth, enrollment records, and student achievement (e43-44). Due to the lack of baseline data for student achievement objectives, whether these objectives are ambitious cannot be determined (e42-44). A general goal of increasing the number of high-quality seats in the District by ensuring compliance, providing information and making technical assistance available are insufficient to ensure the increased seats will be of high quality (e42). It is unclear whether meeting these objectives would ensure the success of the overall project.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants**

**1. b. Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants**

**The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates evidence of a well-developed plan to award subgrants. All components to a successful subgrant competition are included, along with a clear description of most requirements (e45-53). The applicant clearly documents key activities and details surrounding the process for applying and receiving a subgrant. The application organizes each type of subgrant application process (Replication and Expansion subgrants and School Takeover subgrants) with thorough detail (e48-49). The applicant provides detail regarding how the subgrant process will support diverse charter models. The applicant utilizes internal research and community feedback to encourage the high demand charter models of dual language/language immersion programs, expeditionary learning pathways, and Montessori programs (e51). In addition, the applicant provides one-time allocation of [REDACTED] in incentive funding in addition to the base subgrant in the effort of prioritizing underserved communities and high schools (e51). The applicant provides sufficient information on publicizing the availability, requirements, and process for subgrant application. The applicant uses multiple methods for publicizing grant availability, including a Grants Forecast webpage for LEAs and other stakeholders, LEA Look Forward newsletter, DC's Office of Partnerships and Grant Services, and through local and national newsletters and bulletins (e50). The applicant adequately explains how it will ensure each subgrantee will plan for

student transportation needs. New public charter schools receive technical assistance related to student transportation as part of the New LEA Support team training series, both in the spring and summer prior to school opening (e52).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide a process for selecting peer reviewers for the CSP subgrants, and the process of reviewing and awarding subgrants is not described in sufficient detail. The application states that a minimum of two program staff review each subgrant application prior to issuing the grant award notification, but does not explain the process of this review and awarding of CSP subgrants (e48). The applicant states that a peer review process is unnecessary due to the rigor of the PCSB charter application process (e48). The rigor of the PCSB charter application process, however, is not described in enough detail to allow reviewers to make an informed judgement as to whether a peer review process is unnecessary.

**Reader's Score: 14**

**Selection Criteria - State Plan**

**1. c. State Plan**

**The State entity's plan to--**

**Reader's Score: 33**

**Sub**

**1. (1) Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a comprehensive monitoring plan addressing how subgrantees are monitored regularly, have risks identified quickly, and how subgrantees are required to address deficiencies promptly. Subgrantees are required to submit annual full fiscal documentation and semi-annual programmatic reports. In addition, the applicant will follow its Division of Systems and Supports K-12's Risk-Based Monitoring guidance which considers a risk-assessment criterion to determine additional monitoring. The applicant provides comprehensive detail surrounding this prioritized risk-assessment criterion in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.331(b) (e53-53). The applicant describes all activities and systems used to ensure effective monitoring, complete with monitoring timeline (e162). Both desktop monitoring and onsite monitoring are described in detail, along with comprehensive detail on how deficiencies would be addressed by the subgrantee in the form of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (e56). The applicant clearly describes how monitoring will ensure that subgrantees are using funds for activities to help meet education needs of students, specifically including students with disabilities and English learners. The applicant uses Title III and IDEA sections of the Coordinated Risk-Based Monitoring Tool for determining whether federal funds have been used appropriately to meet these student needs (e57). The applicant explains the process for evaluating subgrantees' plans for sustainability once funds are no longer available. The applicant staff will evaluate a sustainability question within the application rubric and provide feedback to the subgrantee, if necessary. The applicant also includes space for subgrantees to explain plans for sustainability and any changes that have occurred within the semi-annual programmatic reports (e58).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. (2) Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies;**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides an innovative and thorough plan for how to avoid duplication of work for charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies. This plan reduces burden for both in a significant way. The applicant uses the charter application as the CSP application, thereby allowing them to submit only one in-depth application to become authorized and receive startup funding (e59). The applicant uses risk-based monitoring and data collection models that have been consolidated for overlapping aspects of fiscal and programmatic monitoring and data collection systems and tools (e59). The applicant releases an LEA Data Collection Template for facilitating the daily collection of student demographic enrollment, contacts, and attendance data (e60). The applicant and authorizer collaborate to unite discipline data collections with a shared template incorporating legally mandated data elements (e60).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted..

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. (3) Provide technical assistance and support for--**

- i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
- ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State;**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a well-developed plan for providing technical assistance to subgrantees for supporting the opening and operating of new charter schools and in replicating and expanding high-quality charter schools. The applicant describes the use of a needs assessment to develop and prioritize a technical assistance series for all CSP subgrantees (e62). The applicant documents all necessary areas for subgrantee technical assistance and plans to require all subgrantees attend two sessions within the technical assistance series each year. These are provided either in-person or via webinar (e64). The applicant also provides detail surrounding subgrant application review to provide targeted technical assistance (e63).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provides a plan to support quality authorizing efforts to the one authorized public chartering agency in the District by conducting a needs assessment. However, the applicant does not provide detail on this needs assessment (e64). Although the applicant states that a Memorandum of Understanding with the Public Charter School Board will be developed and does list the required variety of authorizer technical assistance topics, a detailed description of activities is missing (e64-65). Due to the lack of detail and description, it is unclear whether this technical assistance will strengthen authorizing practices in the District.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**4. (4) The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State; and**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a detailed plan for soliciting input from parents and community members. The plan shares multiple elements of this input, such as requiring evidence that a school has engaged and responded to community stakeholders, including families and school staff prior to permission for an enrollment ceiling increase (e66). In addition, the applicant manages a State Advisory Panel (SAP) on special Education which seeks meaningful input from parents and community partners on local issues relative to the provision of services for special needs students (e67). The applicant states the necessary subgrant application requirements for family and community engagement prior to subgrant approval (e65-66). The applicant has built the DC School Report Card (Fall 2017) in partnership with families using in-person feedback sessions, grassroots opportunities at EdFEST (annual citywide public-school fair), in street interviews, and through an online survey (e68).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted..

**Reader's Score: 5**

**5. (5) The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly demonstrates flexibility offered by the District's charter law and how the applicant maximizes this flexibility to greatly support charter schools. DC Code 38-1802.04(c)(3) grants charter schools "exclusive control over its expenditures, administration, personnel, and instructional methods" and exempts charter schools from "District of Columbia Statutes, policies, rules, and regulations established for the District of Columbia public schools" (e69). In addition, each DC charter school is organized as a non-profit organization governed by an independent board of trustees per DC Code 38-1802.04(c)(6) and (16) (e70). The applicant explains that the subgrant application allows for the flexibility to create both academic and financial goals and charter schools create their own budgets for funding (e70).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. d. Quality of the Management Plan**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 11

Sub

- 1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a well-developed management plan with a list of specific key project personnel. The project director, primary CSP program analyst, and secondary program analyst all have demonstrated qualifications to contribute to the project's success (e71). The applicant's proposed budget is aligned with the management of the grant (e1383-1386).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide a clear timeline and milestones appropriate for all objectives of the grant. There is no mention of progress on specific objective measures (i.e. statewide performance each year for high schoolers on PARCC in ELA and Math) (e70-74). The applicant provides no evidence of budgetary items related to Objective #3, "Improving statewide performance each year for high schoolers on PARCC in ELA and Math for all students, economically-disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English Learner" (e1383-1386). The management plan includes adequate resources of external partners, but does not provide a description for managing this work (e73).

Reader's Score: 7

- 2. (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project**

**Strengths:**

The applicant mentions conducting needs assessments during the first year of the project. In addition, the applicant provides a variety of methods for collecting feedback, including sending a survey to all participants (e74). The applicant uses this feedback to re-assess needs following technical assistance offerings (e74).



Sub

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's plan on how feedback will be analyzed and used to improve the proposed project lacks significant details (e73-74). The application simply states that feedback on the subgrant program and technical assistance series will be collected on an ongoing basis to re-assess needs (e73).

**Reader's Score:** 2

3. (3) **The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents detailed information on the time commitments of the project director and the other two key personnel. This includes the percentage of time each staff member plans to spend on the project (e71). The time dedicated to the project is appropriate and adequate to meet the goals and objectives of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. CPP3 Competitive Preference Priority 3: Equitable Financing**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides comprehensive information that clearly demonstrates the State fully ensures charter schools receive equitable financing in comparison to traditional public schools in a prompt manner. The District of Columbia uses a Uniform per Student Funding formula (UPSFF) for both public schools and charter schools first implemented for SY19-20 in accordance with DC Code 38-2901 (e19). The applicant fully explains the types and amounts of financing available as well as the flow of monies to both charter and traditional public schools. The UPSFF provides funding weights by grade level for subgroups (students with disabilities, limited English proficiency, at-risk students and students in alternative, adult, and residential schools) as well as provides funding to cover capital facilities costs (e19). Funding is provided on a per pupil basis and provided in quarterly installments, with funding flexibility based on student enrollment and status changes as well as flexibility for new or existing charter school needs (e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4**

**1. CPP4 Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) Funding for facilities;
- b) Assistance with facilities acquisition;
- c) Access to public facilities;
- d) The ability to share in bonds or mill levies;
- e) The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings; or
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges.

**Strengths:**

The applicant details State provided avenues for charter schools facilities access. The Direct Loan Fund provides flexible loan capital for construction, purchase, renovation and maintenance of charter school facilities (e22). The Credit Enhancement Fund provides enhanced credit, lease guarantees and access to financial assistance to eligible public charter schools for acquisition, renovation, and/or construction of school facilities (e22). Funding is also available through Facility Financing Grants through Scholarships for Opportunity and Results (SOAR) Act (e22). The applicant also documents the Charter School Incubator Initiative (CSII). The CSII is a 501(c)(3) public-private partnership that leases sites which are renovated and subleased to new public charter schools serving communities with student populations with at least 50 percent free and reduced-price lunch (e21).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant provides State methods for charter school facility access, the applicant does not provide examples of these methods producing results (e19-21).

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5**

**1. CPP5 Competitive Preference Priority 5: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies.

**Strengths:**

The applicant documents evidence of State sponsored and supported professional development to support struggling traditional public schools, LEAs, and public charter schools. The Office of State Superintendent of Education's (OSSE) division of Teaching and Learning (TAL) uses its Professional Development Team to deliver responsive systems of professional learning to LEAs, traditional public schools and public charter schools (e23). Professional development is advertised through TAL's monthly PD bulletin and OSSE's LEA Look Forward weekly newsletter, with subscribers including public charter schools (e23). In addition, the applicant states that Communities of Practice are offered to allow educators with diverse perspectives and experience to convene regularly to share best practices (e23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6****1. CPP6 Competitive Preference Priority 6: Serving At-Risk Students**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately demonstrates how the Office of State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) fully supports all traditional public and charter schools serving at-risk students through dropout recovery and dropout prevention services. The DC ReEngagement Center (REC) is a "single door" through which youth ages 16-24 who have dropped out of secondary school can reconnect to educational options, including public charter schools (e26). The OSSE and Raise DC created a 9th grade transition program, Bridge to High School Data Exchange and Kid Talk, which aims to support 9th grade transition work in order to address issues of retention and high school completion (e26-27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7****1. CPP7 Competitive Preference Priority 7: Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it has taken steps to ensure that all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides comprehensive evidence of taking steps to ensure the Public Charter School Board (as the District's sole charter authorizer) implements best practices for charter school authorizing. The PCSB's School Quality Reports utilize a common evaluation tool called the Performance Management Framework (PMF) to detect trends and compare academic performance across all 123 public charter schools that are managed by 66 independently run nonprofit organizations (e27, e29). Measurable impact is evident as PCSB has been recognized as one of the nation's leading charter school authorizers on multiple occasions. In 2018, the National Association of Charter School Authorizers published a case study on PCSB to document and share promising authorizing practices (e29). In 2016, PCSB published a Best Practices and Resources report to share sample resources that authorizers around the country may adapt for use in their own states (e29). The applicant states how implementation of best practices is ensured. The OSSE reviews publications, tracking board actions, and participates in the charter application review process. OSSE staff maintain a tracker of all PCSB actions, and review School Quality Reports and Financial Analysis Reports each year. In addition, OSSE staff observes capacity interviews and public hearings during the charter application review cycle each year (e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/02/2020 10:54 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2020 10:54 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	29
<b>Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants</b>		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
<b>State Plan</b>		
1. State Plan	35	33
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	13
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. CPP3	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. CPP4	4	4
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 5</b>		
1. CPP5	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CPP6	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CPP7	4	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	16	16
<b>Total</b>	116	106

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP State Entities - 3: 84.282A

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. a. Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 29

#### Sub

##### 1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale;

#### Strengths:

One of the strengths of the proposed OSSE design is that it builds on an existing framework of successful charter school implementation and expansion. As stated in the rationale, "If awarded another grant under this competition, OSSE will continue to award funds for these purposes to all public charter schools that meet the eligibility requirements of the CSP to meet the objective of increasing the number of high-quality charter school seats in the District (e30)".

The proposal provides several evaluative measures which are outlined in the project logic model. "OSSE's project logic model's, objectives, and performance measures will be used to reflect on project fidelity and impact on at least an annual basis. The project objectives are also aligned with DC's ESSA State Plan, which was developed in consultation with LEAs, schools, community-based organizations, parents, families, teachers, staff, and community members (e38)".

OSSE's theory of action is that if it, "awards subgrant funding to all newly-approved public charter LEAs and all high-quality public charter schools approved by PCSB to replicate, expand, or take over operations for a closing public school, and provides strong technical assistance to all subgrantees and the District's sole authorizer, then the number of high-quality charter school seats in the District will continue to increase and the District will meet the annual academic performance targets in DC's ESSA State Plan while closing achievement gaps. OSSE's focus on high school student performance and prioritization of underserved communities is described further in selection criterion (e38)". The rationale or "theory of action" is clearly demonstrated in this response.

#### Weaknesses:

Although the applicant builds on current program success and provides an ambitious expansion plan, there could be more differentiation among current programming, ongoing expansion plans and specific indicators as to whether new sites will replicate an existing successful model or innovate with new programming.

Whenever possible, use the language in the application to clearly indicate that the theory of action (for example) is the rationale.

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

**2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly addresses performance measures established to measure annual progress toward achieving the purpose of increasing the number of charter schools and the percentage of 4th and 8th grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient level on State assessments in math and reading/language arts.

As stated, "OSSE's theory of action is that if it awards subgrant funding to all newly-approved public charter LEAs and all high-quality public charter schools approved by PCSB to replicate, expand, or take over operations for a closing public school, and provides strong technical assistance to all subgrantees and the District's sole authorizer, then the number of high-quality charter school seats in the District will continue to increase and the District will meet the annual academic performance targets in DC's ESSA State Plan while closing achievement gaps (e30)."

A comprehensive set of Logic Models outlined Performance measures and expected outcomes anticipated with grant implementation. For example, "The percentage of high school students scoring at level 4 or higher on the PARCC ELA assessment will increase by 2.5% each year, to meet the annual targets in DC's ESSA State Plan. Performance Measure 3.b The percentage of economically-disadvantaged high school students scoring at level 4 or higher on the PARCC ELA assessment will increase by 2.9% each year, to meet the annual targets in DC's ESSA State Plan," specifies the populations and academic targets.

Also, the performance measures indicate measures to "Improve statewide performance each year for high school students on PARCC in ELA and Math for all students, economically-disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English Learners to meet the annual targets in DC's ESSA State Plan and close achievement gaps (e40)."

The applicant addresses the criterion, using graphs and logic models to illustrate performance measures and expected outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

The narrative did not follow the outline, as provided in the grant guidelines, which made it challenging to pull out requisite information for each criterion. Provide specific examples to identify and distinguish quantitative and/or qualitative data. Whenever possible, provide process information of how evaluative measures (such as needs assessment) are carried out.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**3. (3) The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entities program**

**Strengths:**

As described, "OSSE proposes three ambitious, yet attainable project objectives for the CSP grant (e38-40)." Each objective is addressed in a graph which provides strategies, evaluative measures and contractual agreements with sub-grantees (e38)".

Applicants for both CSP sub grants will be selected for award based primarily on capacity for increasing the number of students it serves in high-quality schools, its probable impact on the number of students served in low-performing schools, and the cohesiveness of its start-up or replication plan (e52).

Finally, the applicant expands "opportunities for diverse models, including programs designed for at-risk students and rural communities (e54)".

Every regional education service center in the state (many of which have close ties to rural communities) are prepared to support the operation of charter schools that might otherwise struggle to secure financial and other support services (e54)".

**Sub**

The applicant has an ambitious plan which includes diverse models and populations.

**Weaknesses:**

The narrative did not follow the guidelines for this grant cycle making it more difficult to determine if it fully developed responses. The applicant did not provide baseline date. Without baseline date, it is unclear whether the growth targets were ambitious; therefore, making it difficult to determine if the State entity's objectives were carried out under the grant.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants****1. b. Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants**

**The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students.**

**Strengths:**

One of the strengths of the subgrant applicant process for OSSE is that a "crosswalk" document graphs all requirements and resources to develop a high-quality charter school. As cited, "Requirements for public charter schools under DC Code align with the federal definition of a charter school, and therefore all public charter school authorized to operate in the District meet the federal definition. OSSE still performs an eligibility review prior to awarding CSP subgrants, and includes assurances within the subgrant application to ensure that the subgrant applicant meets each component of the definition. OSSE has developed a crosswalk between the federal definition of a charter school and the relevant requirements under DC Code All subgrant applicants are thoroughly reviewed to determine that they meet eligibility requirements and are offered training and direct access to available administrative resources at an "onboarding" meeting (e45)".

"Prior to this meeting, subgrant applicants are notified of required documents and forms needed to register for OSSE's EGMS and ultimately receive payment. At the onboarding meeting, subgrant applicants receive a basic EGMS training and introduction to OSSE, as well as details about the subgrant timeline and requirements (e45)."

The rigor of the application process itself is a strength. "The subgrant application includes: project SMART goals, financial SMART goals, a logic model, a plan to serve students with disabilities, a detailed budget and budget narrative, a sustainability plan to ensure continued operations after the subgrant has ended, a Board of Trustees roster and certification by the Board chair, CSP required descriptions and program-specific assurances (e46)."

As further assurance, " PCSB's enrollment ceiling increase policy, which is used to determine approval of replications and expansions, is aligned with the federal definition of high-quality. OSSE will perform an additional eligibility review to ensure that each potential applicant meets the definition of high-quality and is not receiving CSP funding from the U.S. Department of Education under a different program (e48)."

Additionally, OSSE also aims to award CSP subgrant funding to all high-quality public charter schools that have been approved by PCSB to replicate or expand. The applicant provides a rigorous application process to review that eligible applicants will meet objectives and improve educational results for all students. The applicant states, "Specifically, to meet our "high-quality" threshold, applicants will be required to explain how they plan to enroll significant numbers of at-risk students and how they plan to provide those students with instructionally rigorous and culturally affirming educations, and existing operators will need to demonstrate a track record of success in these areas (e41-42)." Further, a table (e38) provides a comprehensive of existing program models (including, STEM, Global, Art & Sciences, College readiness, and more).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.



Reader's Score: 15

## Selection Criteria - State Plan

### 1. c. State Plan

The State entity's plan to--

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

#### 1. (1) Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;

##### Strengths:

An apparent strength is a comprehensive approach to monitor eligible applicants who receive subgrants through onsite and digital procedures. As stated, "OSSE conducts monitoring activities through both desktop and onsite monitoring. Desktop monitoring is a tiered monitoring approach that can be as specific as a request for documentation supporting a single reimbursement request or as expansive as a request for all supporting documentation for a semi-annual report or an external audit (e54) "

This indicates strength in data driven administration and instruction After an onsite evaluation, which is coordinated agency-wide, and addresses total program implementation, (including programs for students with disabilities and English learners) an exit interview with key subgrantee staff to provide general feedback, outline outstanding documentation requests and the timeline for their submission, and discuss other information critical to drafting OSSE's onsite monitoring report to the subgrantee (e56)."

Another strength is that corrective action and improvement activities for the subgrantee to correct noncompliance, are also addressed. "OSSE's risk-based monitoring and data collection models have consolidated the overlapping aspects of fiscal and programmatic monitoring and data collection systems and tools that include aspects common to all or most grants. This consolidation has streamlined monitoring and data collection processes for the LEAs and other subgrantees by reducing the paperwork burden of reporting information multiple times to various OSSE entities. OSSE's risk-based monitoring and data collection models have consolidated the overlapping aspects of fiscal and programmatic monitoring and data collection systems and tools that include aspects common to all or most grants (e56)."

It is evident that a streamlined and coordinated monitoring system is in place.

##### Weaknesses:

A timeline of monitoring activities, including mid-course monitoring activities, cross referenced for the roles of PCSP, OSSE and individual sites, would be useful.

Reader's Score: 9

#### 2. (2) Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies;

##### Strengths:

A significant strength is that PCBS and OSSE collaborate and consolidate on every phase of charter school authorizing.

"This process, which has been approved by USED in the past, has resulted in awarding planning and implementation grants to 100% of the charters authorized through PCSB's rigorous and high-quality review process that meet the federal definition of a charter school. It also significantly reduces administrative burden on new charter

**Sub**

applicants in the District of Columbia, as well as avoiding duplication of work by allowing them to submit only one in-depth application to become authorized and receive crucial startup funding (e59)."

Furthermore, "OSSE provides an optional, free SIS, eSchoolsPlus, to all LEAs that elect to use it. This allows for easy adoption and seamless mapping of data from the LEA's SIS to OSSE's data systems OSSE and PCSB collaborate to unite discipline data collections with a shared template that incorporates the legally mandated data elements. This is another effort to ensure accurate data, reduce the burden of duplicative data submissions, and protect student privacy (e59)."

This successful track record and collaborative effort is an organizational strength for the benefit of meeting performance objectives.

**Weaknesses:**

No Weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) Provide technical assistance and support for--**
  - i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
  - ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State;**

**Strengths:**

i. Eligible applicants: The applicant contracts a 3rd party vendor to provide assistance in grant development and review. A strength is that " OSSE will require that all charter school CSP subgrantees attend two sessions within the technical assistance series each year (e.64)."

Further, "New public charter schools receive technical assistance related to student transportation as part of the New LEA Support team training series, in the spring and summer prior to their opening (e52)."

The applicant, " will also provide subgrantee technical assistance through an online webpage dedicated to sharing resources and materials from the technical assistance sessions (e64)."

ii Quality authorizing in the state: The applicant provides a detailed account of the role of PCSB, the sole authorizing agency in the District of Columbia. OSSE will develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PCSB in order to support quality authorizing efforts and ensure that technical assistance will be delivered.

A strength is in the partnership was clearly delineated through "a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PCSB in order to support quality authorizing efforts and ensure that technical assistance will be delivered on a variety of topics addressing, at minimum, all of the following areas: assessing annual performance data of the schools; financial review and assistance with annual audits; holding charter schools accountable to their performance agreements; reviewing processes related to renewal, non-renewal, or revocation of the school's charter; and establishing clear plans and procedures to assist students enrolled in a charter school that closes to attend other high-quality charter schools (e64)."

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide indicators of how effective these strategies and procedures have been in the past. A detailed technology plan with targeted objectives and projected outcomes would strengthen this component.

**Reader's Score: 9**

- 4. (4) The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State; and**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has developed an infrastructure and organizational strategies to engage parents. A strength for family and communication engagement is an, "outreach campaign utilizes multipronged strategies to reach target communities (at-risk families and families with language and digital literacy barriers): partner training and parent workshops, field outreach (e.g., "high traffic" canvassing, phone banking, tabling at events, staffing of a community office for in-person application support), paid advertising (transit, print, radio, TV, and digital), support at school open houses, government relations, email and text alerts, EdFEST – the annual citywide public school fair, and a multilingual hotline for support (e65-66)."

The guidelines established in the application process for parent and community input are clearly stated to include:

- An explanation of the community engagement progress to date and plan moving forward for incorporating diverse stakeholders, touch points, and tactics, which are well-suited to reach the school's target population,
- Evidence that the founding group began its community outreach before their application submission,
- Evidence that the founding group demonstrates an understanding of the economic, political, historical, and social contexts of the community it seeks to serve,
- A demonstrated understanding of the unique characteristics of DC's education landscape, and awareness of its communities' wants and needs, as well as assets and strengths, and
- A description of how members of the community have been involved in the design and will continue to be involved in the implementation of the proposed school, as well as a decision-making process for determining when and how to adjust plans based on such feedback.

**Weaknesses:**

No Weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**5. (5) The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law**

**Strengths:**

The legislation which provides autonomy is a strength and allows the sites greater flexibility. The applicant clearly states, "In addition to autonomy over budget, expenditures, staffing, procurement, and curriculum, each DC charter school is organized as a non-profit organization governed by a independent board of trustees (DC Code 38-1802.04(c)(6) and (16)) (e69- 70)."

There is a correlation to the degree of flexibility and accountability which is a strength. As stated, "DC Charter schools have a high degree of autonomy in exchange for accountability for results. Schools are held accountable by PCSB with a review of results every five years. OSSE and PCSB use transparency to create incentives for strong school performance (e70)."

The coordination of the efforts by both partners affords a degree of flexibility for charter schools under law.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. d. Quality of the Management Plan**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In**

determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and

**Strengths:**

A project strength is evident in clearly established roles and responsibilities of key personnel, "OSSE's three program staff will ensure completion of project activities described in this application, in addition to ongoing requirements of the program such as completing and submitting Annual Performance Reports, participating in program monitoring, responding to requests from the program contact at the U.S. Department of Education, and data collection (e71)."

Further, the project director and program analyst's roles are to, "Review all reimbursement requests and budget amendments in a timely manner to ensure compliance with federal and local statute and regulations, and DC's Quick Payment Act (e72, #8)."

The management plan is detailed with a listing of activities required for all personnel with appropriate deadlines and contacts. Subgrantees can refer to this table to determine timelines and key personnel for activities and strategies outlined in the grant

**Weaknesses:**

A chart or graph that cross references roles and responsibilities with time and budgetary constraints would be helpful.

Reader's Score: 8

2. (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project

**Strengths:**

Oversight is provided through a partnership with OSSE and other key personnel. "Executive team meetings are attended by the DME, the State Superintendent, the DCPS Chancellor, and the PCSB Executive Director. The agency heads report progress to the Deputy Mayor of Education, and all attendees discuss matters related to academic outcomes, operations, attendance, truancy, school openings, school closings, and services to special populations. In discussing city education policies and matters at these meetings, there is a focus on ensuring charter schools maintain autonomy while also meeting the terms of their charters and academic performance expectations. PCSB and OSSE ensure charter school accountability by working together to close schools if PCSB votes to revoke or to not renew a school's charter. (e76)." Additionally, the applicant works closely with the District of Columbia, "The District of Columbia formally evaluates the performance of PCSB each year, requiring PCSB to submit to the DC Council a Performance Accountability Report. As part of this report, PCSB annually sets specific measures to achieve, including measures related to the performance of its portfolio of charter schools (e77)."

**Weaknesses:**

No Weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Sub

**3. (3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has provided detailed time commitments and duties and responsibilities of the project director and principal investigator. "The project director, Ms. Ronda Lasko, is the Director of the OPCSFS and plans to spend roughly 50% of her time on the CSP project. Ms. Lasko has been at OSSE since 2010 and has directly worked on OSSE's 2010 and 2015 CSP grants (e71)."

The primary CSP program analyst, Ms. Brianna Griffin, will spend roughly 50% of her time on CSP grant administration and 25% of her time overseeing and providing CSP subgrantee technical assistance.

The secondary program analyst, Ms. Marie Hutchins, will spend roughly 25% of her time on the CSP project. The secondary program analyst, Ms. Marie Hutchins, will spend roughly 25% of her time on the CSP project. (e72)."

The roles and time commitments of key personnel were clearly designated.

**Weaknesses:**

No Weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. CPP3 Competitive Preference Priority 3: Equitable Financing**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.**

**Strengths:**

The application states, "Charter LEAs are also eligible to receive supplemental funding for changes to a student's at-risk, EL, or special education status that occur after the enrollment audit."

It further provides evidence that "funding weights by grade level and for the following subgroups: students with disabilities, Limited English proficiency (LEP)/English language learners, at-risk students and students in alternative, adult, and residential schools. In addition to the foundational funding level and percentage add-ons for students with particular characteristics, the formula also provides funding to cover capital facilities costs at public charter schools on a per pupil basis (e19)."

The application also provides a detailed funding breakdown of equitable allocations for students and schools which are dispersed incrementally with an emphasis on release of funds prior to or early in the academic year.

As stated, quarterly payments for the education-portion of the UPSFF (as opposed to the facility-portion of the UPSFF) are structured so that charter LEAs receive a larger portion of their total annual funding in the beginning of the school year (e20)."

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4**

## 1. CPP4 Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) Funding for facilities;
- b) Assistance with facilities acquisition;
- c) Access to public facilities;
- d) The ability to share in bonds or mill levies;
- e) The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings; or
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges.

### Strengths:

The applicant cites a variety of methods to support funding and facility access. In addition to per pupil allotment, "OSSE's Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support (OPCSFS), administers a Direct Loan and Credit Enhancement program, offers a Facilities Grant program, and supports an Incubator Initiative for Charter Schools (e21)."

These initiatives provide assistance in acquisition, renovation, and construction of charter schools in the District of Columbia. "Credit Enhancement Funding provides enhanced credit, lease guarantees, and access to financial assistance to eligible public charter schools for the acquisition, renovation, and/or construction of school facilities (e22)."

The applicant provides comprehensive support in obtaining fiscal help for facility acquisition or renovation.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 4

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5

### 1. CPP5 Competitive Preference Priority 5: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies.

### Strengths:

The applicant offers a wide variety of professional learning opportunities and intervention strategies for struggling schools, such as, "professional development, direct LEA/school-based support, the facilitation of communities of practice, and through city-wide convenings (e23)."

Additionally, "OSSE's Investment in Schools grant supports the use of evidence-based strategies and Interventions to improve struggling schools identified for Comprehensive Support (CS) and Improvement. OSSE's Investment in Schools grant supports the use of evidence-based strategies and interventions to improve struggling schools identified for Comprehensive Support (CS) and Improvement (e25)."

These and other interventions and innovations provide evidence of best practices to improve struggling schools and LEA's.

### Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 2

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

#### 1. CPP6 Competitive Preference Priority 6: Serving At-Risk Students

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.

##### Strengths:

A variety of support services for at-risk students are evident. The "DC ReEngagement Center (REC) conducts targeted outreach to students who have dropped out, as well as engaging walk-ins and referrals; assessing academic status and nonacademic needs of youth and using this information to help them develop personalized rearrangement plans; identifying good-fit educational options; and providing ongoing support for at least one year once re-enrolled (e50)."

There is also a program developed by the College and Career Readiness team to address 9th grade transition, Bridge to High School Data Exchange and Kid Talk, which addresses a predictive low graduation rate for 9th graders.

This priority has been met.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

#### 1. CPP7 Competitive Preference Priority 7: Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it has taken steps to ensure that all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing.

##### Strengths:

The applicant is unique in that there is a sole authorizer, Public Charter School Board (PCSB), that "provides academic and financial oversight to all 123 public charter schools that are managed by 66 independently run nonprofit organizations. PCSB is led by a board consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the city council (e27)."

It is evident that steps are taken to ensure implementation of best practices for authorizing charter schools at each level of implementation and evaluation. "At least once every five years, PCSB reviews each school to confirm it is meeting the goals set forth in the charter agreement. In the school's 15th year of operation, it is required to submit a full charter renewal application. PCBS also conducts site reviews to provide school leaders and the public with qualitative evidence in two domains: Classroom Environment and Instruction. PCBS staff and consultants certified in using the Charlotte Danielson Framework rubric conduct unannounced classroom observations." (e28)

Further evidence of strategies to ensure implementation of best practice, include: "PCBS has been recognized as one of the nation's leading charter school authorizers on multiple occasions. In 2018, the National Association of Charter School Authorizers published a Case Study on PCBS to document and share promising authorizing practices. In 2016, PCBS published a Best Practices and Resources report to shar sample resources that authorizers around the country may adapt for use in their own states." (e20)

Finally, as further evidence," since 2012, PCBS has managed the closure of 35 low performing public charter schools for either fiscal concerns or academic performance." (e26)

**Weaknesses:**

No Weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/02/2020 10:54 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2020 10:54 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	29
<b>Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants</b>		
1. Subgrant Applicants	15	15
<b>State Plan</b>		
1. State Plan	35	34
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	11
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	89
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. CPP3	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
1. CPP4	4	4
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 5</b>		
1. CPP5	2	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CPP6	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CPP7	4	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	16	16
<b>Total</b>	116	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - CSP State Entities - 3: 84.282A

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. a. Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 29

#### Sub

##### 1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale;

#### Strengths:

The application proposal demonstrates an appropriate rationale of operational relationships among key project components and outcomes over time in promoting state-level strategies for struggling schools. The applicant provides a rationale based on a research-based operational theory of action to expand a charter schools takeover model to improve state designated struggling schools. The applicant proposes a rationale supported by a logic model based on case study evaluation findings aligned with the ESSA state plan that likely realize relevant outcomes. The applicant presents the charter schools' needs and growth analysis data points, State charter school closure policy, and case study evaluation findings to achieve key priorities aligned with the logic model. For example, the applicant explains a rationale grounded in case study evaluation findings highlighting key responsibilities, lessons learned, and capacity building solutions for high quality take-over charter schools to turnaround and improve low-performing schools (e37-e38, e42-e43, e49).

#### Weaknesses:

The application proposal could be strengthened with consistent use of the application language that is supporting the rationale. The applicant would be encouraged to provide a clear description of why the exclusion of replication implementation funding would realize ongoing expansion project outcome to produce intended results (e37-e38).

Reader's Score: 13

##### 2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and

#### Strengths:

The application presents adequate methods of evaluation that include the use of objective performance measures aligned with ESSA state plans. The applicant presents clear data collection and analysis protocols of quantitative data related to the objective and intended outcomes. The application proposal examines specific performance indicators such as fourth-and-eighth-grade academic proficiency levels and the federal cost per student efficiency to measure annual progress towards achieving intended outcomes. The applicant outlines measures of success with

**Sub**

improvements with quality schools management and compliance, quality technical assistance, and student achievement of charter school students, especially from underserved communities. For example, the applicant presents an objective performance measure targeting 100% of grantees and authorizers to receive two targeted technical assistance opportunities annually through webinars as well as on-site and online resources (e38-e41).

**Weaknesses:**

The application proposal would be stronger with a clearer explanation of how performance measure 2.a and 2.b. technical assistance needs assessment for subgrantees would be adequately assessed and used for data points to accomplish the proposed project (e39). The application could be strengthened with clear examples of objective performance measures that includes specific qualitative data tied to the intended outcomes (e38-e41).

**Reader's Score: 13**

**3. (3) The ambitiousness of the State entity's objectives for the quality charter school program carried out under the CSP State Entities program**

**Strengths:**

The applicant comments on shift of priority with the quality implementation of charter schools. The applicant presents objectives that are tied to the project. For example, the objectives align with the state ESSA plans (e38-e41).

**Weaknesses:**

The application proposal would be stronger with specific baseline for each objective and performance measure on student performance to make a clear determination of ambitious objectives for improving student outcomes. The application could be also be strengthened with specific data points and rationale on enrollment growth to support increase in proposed number of schools seats (e38-e41).

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants**

**1. b. Quality of Eligible Subgrant Applicants**

**The likelihood that the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the program will meet those objectives and improve educational results for students.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a solid plan to support eligible subgrant applicants to meet objectives and improve educational results for educationally disadvantaged students. The applicant provides an annual review cycle, charter application guidelines, and risk-based monitoring guidance to support the expansion opportunity of quality school choice for students and families. For example, the applicant introduces the qualified opportunity zones and high school diverse models such as dual language, language immersion, expeditionary learning pathways and Montessori programs. Additionally, the application proposal demonstrates quality choice funding to support under-resourced low performing school communities, family and community engagement, charter school flexibility and specialty school transportation services. The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the subgrant application requirements. The applicant publicizes sufficient information on the availability of subgrants through the grants forecast webpage, newsletters, grants clearinghouse, and register notice of funding availability (e45-e53).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - State Plan**

**1. c. State Plan**

**The State entity's plan to--**

**Reader's Score: 34**

**Sub**

**1. (1) Adequately monitor the eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program;**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a strong monitoring plan of quality controls to ensure eligible applicants receive subgrants in compliance with state and federal requirements. The applicant presents a tiered-level approach using the State division of systems and supports risk-based monitoring guidance manual clear evidence of activities and systems to ensure effective monitoring practices with eligible applicants. For example, the applicant proposes risk-based operations, specialized education monitoring and compliance manual, performance agreements mechanism, application quality rubric, and programmatic reports to evaluate charter school implementation and support improvement needs. Additionally, the applicant specifies applicant first-year fiscal documentation for corrective actions and improvements based on delineated annual monitoring cycle standard in meeting of underserved student populations. The applicant addresses any deficiencies found with the subgrantee by providing a preliminary report of corrective action (e53-e56).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. (2) Work with the authorized public chartering agencies involved to avoid duplication of work for the charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies;**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a detailed plan to avoid duplication of work for charter schools and authorized public chartering agencies. The application proposal demonstrates one consolidated charter application, enterprise grants management system, and a centralized grants management data transfer system to reduce administrative work burden. For example, the applicant reduces burden of monitoring with coordinating visits, streamlining documentation requests, monitoring reports, and sharing corrective action plans guidance. Additionally, the applicant presents collaborative work with authorized public chartering agencies through a data collection template to ensure accurate data as well as reduce duplicative data submissions burden, and protect student privacy (e59-e62).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. (3) Provide technical assistance and support for--**

- i. The eligible applicants receiving subgrants under the State entity's program; and**
- ii. Quality authorizing efforts in the State;**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides relevant technical assistance and support for eligible applicants throughout the state. The applicant provides impactful support through state divisions and external partners cooperative and contractual agreements. The applicant details eligible applicant participation in two required technical assistance on new, replication, expansion and take over operations sessions annually. Additionally, the applicant provides coherent technical assistance and customized support for quality authorizing through the development of a memorandum of understanding. The application proposal demonstrates a multi-level authorizing review evaluate the educational criteria and operational fiscal components of the charter schools. For example, the applicant assesses the capacity of the charter school developer to open and sustain a charter school. In addition, the applicant presents specific technical assistance in assessing annual performance data, financial review audits, and performance agreements related to renewal, non-renewal, or revocation of charter schools (e52, e54, e57, e62-e65).

**Weaknesses:**

The application proposal could be strengthened with a detailed description of the needs assessment to make a clear determination of quality (e62-e64).

**Reader's Score: 9**

**4. (4) The State entity's plan to solicit and consider input from parents and other members of the community on the implementation and operation of charter schools in the State; and**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes a strong plan for strengthening relationships to solicit and consider input from parents and other community members. The applicant specifies state charter application guidelines of cultural competency activities for specific family and community input strategies on the implementation and operations of charter schools. The applicant provides evidence of robust outreach and engagement of charter school staff, families, and community stakeholders participation. Additionally, the applicant describes parent and community active participation on State special advisory panels regarding charter school recruitment, application, lottery, and the enrollment ceiling increase review policy. The applicant process for input solicitation and consideration occurs with a timeline from December to May annually. The applicant demonstrates a strong process for awarding sub grants funding for program design, initial implementation, recruitment data collection, and information dissemination. For example, the applicant shares annual data reports through weekly newsletter, system of support website, and outreach activities (e65-e68).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

**5. (5) The degree of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law and how the State entity will work to maximize the flexibility provided to charter schools under such law**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes a clear plan to maximize high levels of flexibility afforded by the State's charter school law. The applicant describes clear autonomy and flexibility access through an executed charter agreement for consistency to work with charter schools. Additionally, the applicant provides communication procedure of an equitable funding structure for transparency for higher levels of school performance in charter schools. For example, the applicant presents a funding structure that requires subgrantees to submit academic and financial goals during the entire grant award period. In addition, the applicant includes financial responsibility and management assistance to support high quality charter schools flexibility with expenditures, administration, personnel, and instructional methods (e69-e70).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. d. Quality of the Management Plan**

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 11

Sub

**1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents information specifying objectives, implementation activities, and a budget for the proposed project. The applicant provides management and operations structure of performance oversight procedures. The applicant outlines collaboration of State divisions and external partners to ensure project fidelity, continuous improvement, and compliance. For example, the applicant manages an annual process to review grant activities, program monitoring reviews, equity reports, data collection systems, and school performance accountability of the proposed project. Additionally, the applicant supplies detailed resumes highlighting relevant charter school experience and responsibilities of key project personnel for accomplishing project tasks over the grant period (e70-e77).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The application could be strengthened with detailed description of how working relationships will be managed for the coordination of project proposed tasks with project personnel and external partners. The applicant could benefit from specificity of a project timeline and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (e70-e77).

**Reader's Score: 7**

**2. (2) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides some information in the operations of the proposed project. The applicant presents technical assistance sessions with feedback surveys and a semi-annual reporting template to guide future sessions of subgrant eligible applicants (e34). The applicant reports programmatic and operations feedback from diverse stakeholders. The applicant describes a school transparency and reporting framework of conducting feedback and input sessions with diverse stakeholders such as school staff, authorizers, families, and greater community members on the development of state school improvement accountability plan and school report card (e73-e75).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant could benefit by providing specific details on how feedback will be analyzed and used for continuous improvement to make a clear determination of adequate procedures.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**3. (3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents specific time commitments of the project director and other key personnel. The applicant includes details percentage of time dedicated to meet the proposed project objectives. The applicant reports time commitment for each key project personnel such as the project director, primary program analyst, and secondary program analyst. For example, the assigned project director commits to 50% of her time on the proposed project to oversee the State scholarship for opportunities and results grant as well as the credit enhancement grant and direct loan program (e71).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. CPP3 Competitive Preference Priority 3: Equitable Financing**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located ensures equitable financing, as compared to traditional public schools, for charter schools and students in a prompt manner.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses equitable financing to adequately fund education. The applicant uses the formula funding weights by grade level for students with disabilities, limited English proficiency and with at-risk factors based on alternative, adult, and residential school settings. In addition, the applicant presents foundational funding level of percentage to cover capital facilities costs at public charter schools on a per pupil basis. For example, the applicant provides quarterly payments for audited students who receive new or changed supplemental designations with special program considerations as well as English learners and at-risk designations after the October count day. The applicant presents supplemental payments to charter schools for educationally disadvantaged students with new or expanded of individualized education plans levels, English limited designations, and new at-risk designations (e19-e23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4****1. CPP4 Competitive Preference Priority 4: Charter School Facilities**

To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located provides charter schools one or more of the following:

- a) Funding for facilities;
- b) Assistance with facilities acquisition;
- c) Access to public facilities;
- d) The ability to share in bonds or mill levies;
- e) The right of first refusal to purchase public school buildings; or
- f) Low- or no-cost leasing privileges.

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses charter school facilities by administering a direct loan and credit enhancement program for charter schools. The application proposal demonstrates a direct loan and credit enhancement program to support public charter school with facilities allowance and private financing. The direct loan fund provides flexible loan capital for the construction, purchase, renovation and maintenance of charter school facilities. Additionally, the applicant presents an incubator initiative for new public charter schools' facilities space to focus on charter school operations and curriculum. For example, the scholarships for opportunity and results act funds quality educational facilities to ensure suitable learning environments, quality public charter school options, and public resources in underserved communities (e21-e23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 4

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5****1. CPP5 Competitive Preference Priority 5: Best Practices to Improve Struggling Schools and Local Educational Agencies**



**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the State in which it is located uses best practices from charter schools to help improve struggling schools and local educational agencies.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses best practices to improve struggling schools and local educational agencies. The applicant delivers a responsive system of professional learning through professional development, communities of practice, and state-wide meetings. The application proposal demonstrates investment in schools grant supports through the use of evidence-based strategies, needs assessment, resource equity analysis, and school improvement plans. The applicant publishes an all STAR tour report and an online public charter best practices archive to highlight and disseminate state-wide schools' best practices. For example, the applicant shares open resource best practices such as teaching literacy through inquiry-based learning, student-engaged assessments, school turnaround, and early childhood vertical alignment (e23-e26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

**1. CPP6 Competitive Preference Priority 6: Serving At-Risk Students**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it supports charter schools that serve at-risk students through activities such as dropout prevention, dropout recovery, or comprehensive career counseling services.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant serves at-risk students through an educational attainment option of a high school diploma or general education development. The applicant supports at-risk students with partnerships from the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education, the Department of Employment Services, Raise Disconnected Youth Change Network, schools, community-based organizations, and other key agencies. The applicant introduces targeted outreach, referrals, and personalized re-engagement educational plans for targeted at-risk students. For example, the applicant includes a college and career readiness 9th grade transition program, bridge to high school data exchange, and kid talk to comprehensively support dropout prevention and career counseling of at-risk students (e26-e27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7**

**1. CPP7 Competitive Preference Priority 7: Best Practices for Charter School Authorizing**

**To receive points under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which it has taken steps to ensure that all authorized public chartering agencies implement best practices for charter school authorizing.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses strong implementation with best practices for charter school authorizing. The applicant presents a clear charter application process addressing capacity interview, site visits, and a public hearing. The applicant provides best practices for charter school authorizing oversight to support low-performing public charter schools on fiscal or academic performance. The applicant meets with the school's leadership and board members to discuss concerns, develop corrective actions, and issue alert public notices to improve chronically low-performing schools. For example, the applicant supports compliance, equity, and fidelity strategies to adequately monitor open enrollment of students with disabilities and English Learners (e27-e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/02/2020 10:54 AM

## Technical Review Form

Reader: CSP Staff

Applicant: Office of the State Superintendent of Education (S282A200004)

**Total CPP1 and CPP2 Score**

**6**

---

### **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). An applicant must--**

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; and**
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

**Note:** In responding to this priority, an applicant is encouraged to explain how it will encourage prospective subgrantees to open, replicate, or expand one or more charter schools in a Qualified Opportunity Zone and how that might align to the application requirement response for (I)(C)(i).

#### **Strengths:**

- a. The applicant provided the complete lists of Qualified Opportunity Zone (QOZ) census tracts (e18) for the District of Columbia.
- b. The applicant stated that it would award incentive funding to high-quality charter school that replicate or expand into a QOZ. (e18)

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: One Authorized Public Chartering Agency Other than a LEA, or an Appeals Process**

To meet this priority, the applicant must demonstrate that the State--

- a) Provides for one authorized public chartering agency that is not an LEA, such as a State chartering board, for each individual or entity seeking to operate a charter school pursuant to State law; or
- b) In the case of a State in which LEAs are the only authorized public chartering agencies, allows for an appeals process for the denial of an application for a charter school.

**Note:** In order to meet this priority under paragraph (b) above, the entity hearing appeal must have the authority to approve the charter application over the objections of the LEA.

**Strengths:**

The applicant meets a. The District has a single authorized public chartering agency, the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (PCSB). PCSB is not a local education agency. (e18)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**